

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Doz. 1450 Adexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/674,167	12/28/2000	Nobuyoshi Nambu	0052/036001	2870	
22893 759	90 06/18/2003				
SMITH PATENT OFFICE 1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W SUITE 200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
			CINTINS, I	CINTINS, IVARS C	
			<u> </u>		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724	18-	
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003	/)	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/674,167

Applicant(s)

Nambu et al.

Examiner

Ivars Cintins

Art Unit 1724

	rs on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS S THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply w If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, c Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing department adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 17,	. 2003
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This a	action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowanc closed in accordance with the practice under Exp.	e except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
4) X Claim(s) 28-43	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideratio
5) Claim(s)	
6) 💢 Claim(s) 28-43	
	is/are objected to.
	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement
Application Papers	
9) \square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/	are all accepted or bl objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	is: all approved bl disapproved by the Examine
If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	miner.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreigna) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	
 Certified copies of the priority documents had Copies of the certified copies of the priority 	documents have been received in this National Stage
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domest	
a) The translation of the foreign language provision	nal application has been received.
15) \square Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachment(s)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) U Other:

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Claims 28-41 fail to recite the apparently essential limitation that when the chelate-forming functional group is represented by "Formula 1" it includes "an amino group and at least two hydroxyl groups combined with carbon" (see page 9, lines 16-17 of the specification). Accordingly, these claims are not enabled by the disclosure. In re Mayhew, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Claims 42 and 43 are also not enabled by the disclosure, because these claims fail to recite the apparently essential limitation that the chelate-forming filter produced by the process recited in these claims includes a functional group represented by either "Formula 1" or "Formula 3" as disclosed on pages 9 and 10 of the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1724

Claim 28-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 28-43 fail to recite the above noted essential limitations; and therefore, these claims fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 28-43 are directed to an invention which is not patentably distinct from claims 1-11 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,168,863; or from claims 1-18 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,200,481. Specifically, the chelate-forming fibrous materials and methods recited in the claims of the above noted commonly assigned patents are encompassed by the claims of this application.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent Nos. 6,168,863 and 6,200,481, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned cases qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve

Art Unit: 1724

this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78(c) and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

Claims 28-43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,168,863; or over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,200,481. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in this application are deemed to be obvious variants of the claims in the above noted patents.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by

Art Unit: 1724

a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (703) 308-3840. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Blaine Copenheaver, can be reached at (703) 308-1261.

Art Unit: 1724

The fax phone numbers for this art unit are: (703) 872-9311 for "Official" faxes after Final Rejection; (703) 872-9310 for all other "Official" faxes; and (703) 872-9492 for "Draft" and other "Unofficial" faxes.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Ivars C. Cintins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins
June 15, 2003